hep-th/0109220

Local symmetries of the non-Abelian two-form

Amitabha Lahiri*
S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences,
Block JD, Sector III, Salt Lake,
Calcutta 700 098, INDIA
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

It is proposed that a non-Abelian adjoint two-form in $B \wedge F$ type theories transform inhomogeneously under the gauge group. The resulting restrictions on invariant actions are discussed. The auxiliary one-form which is required for maintaining vector gauge symmetry transforms like a second gauge field, and hence cannot be fully absorbed in the two-form. But it can be replaced, via a vector gauge transformation, by the usual gauge field, leading to gauge equivalences between different types of theories. A new type of symmetry also appears, one which depends on local functions but cannot be generated by constraints. It is connected to the identity in the limit of a vanishing global parameter, so it should be called a semiglobal symmetry. The corresponding conserved currents and BRST charges are parametrized by the space of flat connections.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Ly, 03.50.Kk, 11.10.Lm
Keywords: Topological field theory, non-Abelian two form, non-local symmetry

arXiv:hep-th/0109220v2 15 Oct 2001

I. INTRODUCTION

The non-Abelian two-form, or antisymmetric tensor potential, first made its appearance in the context of non-linear σ-models [1, 2, 3]. It was introduced as a Lagrange multiplier field via an interaction term $\mathrm{Tr}\,\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}B_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\lambda}$, usually written more compactly in the notation of forms as $\mathrm{Tr}\; B\wedge F$. Here B is a two-form potential in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, and F is the curvature of the gauge connection, i.e., the field strength of the gauge field. An action made up of this term alone is a Schwarz type topological field theory [4, 5, 6, 7]. It generalizes to four dimensions the Chern-Simons action, a well known topological quantum field theory in three dimensions [8, 9, 10].

This action serves as the cornerstone for a wide variety of theories in four dimensions. It is diffeomorphism invariant, and can be thought of as 'topological gravity', a toy model for some features of quantum gravity [11, 12, 13]. Some approaches to quantum gravity use the fact that Einstein's theory in four dimensions can be written in terms of the $B \wedge F$ action with additional terms [14], usually with non-compact gauge groups. When the gauge group is taken to be SU(N), modifications of the $B\wedge F$ action lead to Yang-Mills theory in a first order formulation [15, 16, 17, 18], or in a loop space formulation [19, 20]. In these models the two-form appears as a field without its own dynamics.

A theory where the two-form is dynamical can be constructed by introducing a kinetic term [21, 22]. This also happens to be a non-Abelian generalization of a mass generation mechanism for vector fields in four dimensions, which does not have a residual Higgs particle in the spectrum [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. The non-Abelian theory can be quantized in the path integral approach using standard algebraic techniques [29, 30, 31]. This gives a formally renormalizable, gauge invariant theory which contains massive vector bosons but does not have a residual Higgs particle. Note that this mechanism evades established no-go theorems because all those theorems restrict themselves, at some point of the proof, to scalars and vectors only. But rewriting the two-form purely in terms of those degrees of freedom would inevitably lead to a nonlocal field theory, to which those proofs do not apply.

Despite its wide applicability, the nature of the non-Abelian two-form remains obscure. Much of the analysis of theories of the two-form is based on quantization of its interactions. For example, a two-form couples naturally to a world surface, so one possible description of it is as a gauge field for strings, open or closed. This is a consistent description for the Abelian two-form. However, Teitelboim has shown [32] that it is not possible to define 'surface ordered' exponentials for the non-Abelian two-form in a reparametrization invariant fashion. This rules out a non-Abelian generalization of the picture of the two-form as a connection for strings. In another approach, consistency of deformations of theories with the $B\wedge F$ interaction suggests that it is not possible to construct theories with terms quadratic in the non-Abelian two-form, unless additional fields are introduced [33].

In this paper I investigate theories of the non-Abelian two-form from another perspective, namely, that of classical internal symmetries in the Lagrangian formalism. I will display several classical symmetries of theories involving the two-form. These shed some light on the geometrical nature of this field, although precisely what that nature is remains unclear. One outcome of this investigation will be to show that theories of the non-Abelian two-form can be written as theories with two connections, one of which is usual gauge field, and the other has the characteristics of a *dual* connection. I will also

*Electronic address: amitabha@boson.bose.res.in

show that only some of these symmetries are generated by local constraints, a novelty for classical field theories.

What sort of symmetry is imposed on the non-Abelian two-form will dictate the structure of the resulting theory, with its own physical interpretation. This will be the underlying theme of the constructions in this paper, namely, to construct new symmetries by extending known ones, and then to construct actions invariant under them. Some results of this paper have been reported in brief in [34], many details and several new results are presented in this paper.

The starting point is the interaction Lagrangian $\mathrm{Tr}\, B \wedge F$. The integral of this term will be called the action, somewhat loosely, for all theories to be discussed in this paper are built around this term. The symmetries of those theories will necessarily be symmetries of this term alone until Section V, where this term itself will need to be modified. The interaction Lagrangian is often called a 'topological' term, because a background metric is not necessary to define it. However, the metric independence of this term will not be crucial to the results in this paper. Only internal symmetries will be considered below, and invariance of the action will mean invariance up to a total divergence.

In section II the non-Abelian two-form is shown to have an inhomogeneous transformation law under the gauge group. Actions invariant under these transformations are constructed in section III. Vector gauge transformations are introduced in section IV, along with the auxiliary vector field, which is shown to transform as a gauge field as well. The new semiglobal transformations are also discussed there. The connection like nature of the auxiliary field allows a fresh set of transformation rules and actions, shown in section V, but they are shown to be equivalent to the earlier ones. The main results are summarized in section VI.

Notation: It will prove convenient to use the notation of differential forms. The gauge connection one-form (gauge field) is defined in terms of its components as $A = -igA^a_\mu t^a \mathrm{d}x^\mu$, where t^a are the (hermitian) generators of the gauge group satisfying $[t^a, t^b] = if^{abc}t^c$ and g is the gauge coupling constant. Any other coupling constant, which may be required in a given model, will be assumed to have been absorbed in the corresponding field. An example is a coupling constant m of mass dimension one, which appears in the action of some models as $mB \wedge F$, and may be absorbed into B. This will cause no problem since I am dealing solely with classical systems and classical symmetries, and I will display coupling constants explicitly whenever the discussion requires it. The gauge group will be taken to be SU(N). The gauge-covariant exterior derivative of an adjoint p-form ξ_p will be written as

$$\mathrm{d}_A\, \xi_p \equiv \mathrm{d}\, \xi_p + A \wedge \xi_p + (-1)^{p+1} \xi_p \wedge A\,, \qquad (1.1)$$

where d stands for the usual exterior derivative. The field strength is $F = \mathrm{d}A + A \wedge A$, and satisfies Bianchi identity, $\mathrm{d}F + A \wedge F - F \wedge A = 0$. Under a gauge transformation, the gauge field transforms as $A \to A' = UAU^\dagger + \phi$, where for later convenience I have defined $\phi \equiv -\mathrm{d}UU^\dagger$. Note that ϕ is a flat connection, $\mathrm{d}\phi + \phi \wedge \phi = 0$. Unless otherwise noted, a transformed field will be distinguished by a prime, for all types of transformations.

II. GAUGE SYMMETRIES

In this section I shall discuss the construction of a modification of SU(N) gauge transformation rules for the non-Abelian two-form, starting from the usual transformations. As mentioned earlier, the investigation of symmetries of the non-Abelian two-form B has to begin from the action $\int \mathrm{Tr}\, B \wedge F$. In terms of its components, $B = -\frac{1}{2} igmB^a_{\mu\nu} t^a \mathrm{d}x^\mu \wedge \mathrm{d}x^\nu$, with m a constant of mass dimension one. Under an SU(N) gauge transformation represented by U, the gauge field A and the field strength F transform as

$$\begin{aligned} A \to A' &= UAU^\dagger + \phi\,, \\ F \to F' &= UFU^\dagger\,. \end{aligned} \qquad (2.1)$$

Invariance of the action under SU(N) gauge transformation is usually enforced by assuming that B transforms homogeneously in the adjoint, as

$$B \to B' = UBU^\dagger\,. \qquad (2.2)$$

It should be noted that there is no *a priori* reason (based on a geometrical description of the two-form, for example) to assume this transformation law for B.

In addition to SU(N) gauge transformations, the action is invariant under a non-Abelian generalization of Kalb-Ramond gauge transformation [35],

$$B' = B + \mathrm{d}_A \xi, \qquad A' = A\,, \qquad (2.3)$$

where ξ is an arbitrary one-form. Because of Bianchi identity, the Lagrangian changes by a total divergence under this transformation. This will be referred to as vector gauge transformation, while a transformation with U will be called (SU(N), or usual) gauge transformation. The group of vector gauge transformations is Abelian, two such transformations with parameters ξ_1 and ξ_2 combine to yield a transformation with parameter $\xi_1 + \xi_2$. The two types of transformations are independent of each other, and therefore combine as

$$A' = UAU^\dagger + \phi\,, \qquad B' = UBU^\dagger + \mathrm{d}_{A'}\xi'\,, \qquad (2.4)$$

provided the one-form ξ transforms homogeneously in the adjoint as $\xi' = U\xi U^\dagger$.

The first question that needs to be asked concerns the uniqueness of the transformation law in Eq. (2.2), in the light of Eq. (2.3). How arbitrary is the one-form ξ ? It is clear that if the two types of transformations are to remain independent, ξ may not be a connection, i.e., may not transform as $\xi' = U\xi U^\dagger + \phi$. This is because connections do not form a group under addition, for any two

one-forms ξ_1 and ξ_2 which transform like connections, $\xi_1 + \xi_2$ does not transform like a connection. At least ξ cannot be an arbitrary connection one-form. But it is possible to choose a connection, which depends on U, in place of ξ and construct novel symmetries by mixing the two types of transformations.

There is a connection with some degree of arbitrariness which can be used in place of ξ, or more precisely in place of ξ' in Eq. (2.4). It is the flat connection ϕ, constructed from the gauge transformation U as $\phi = -\mathrm{d}UU^\dagger$. This choice modifies Eq. (2.4) to

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= UAU^\dagger + \phi\,, \\ B' &= UBU^\dagger + \mathrm{d}_{A'}\phi \\ &= UBU^\dagger + \Big(A'\wedge\phi + \phi\wedge A' + \mathrm{d}\phi\Big) \\ &= UBU^\dagger + \Big(UAU^\dagger\wedge\phi + \phi\wedge UAU^\dagger + \phi\wedge\phi\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The only arbitrariness in these transformations is in U, there is no arbitrary vector field, so this really has nothing to do with the vector gauge transformations. In fact, it is easy to see that this is nothing but a new gauge transformation law of B. To see this, it is sufficient to show that two successive gauge transformations of B combine according to the group multiplication law of SU(N).

Consider two gauge transformations U_1 and U_2, applied successively to the fields. According to Eq. (2.5), the fields transform under U_1 as

$$A_1 = U_1AU_1^\dagger + \phi_1\,, \qquad B_1 = U_1BU_1^\dagger + \mathrm{d}_{A_1}\phi_1\,, \tag{2.6}$$

with $\phi_1 = -\mathrm{d}U_1U_1^\dagger$, and then under U_2 as

$$A' = U_2A_1U_2^\dagger + \phi_2\,, \qquad B' = U_2B_1U_2^\dagger + \mathrm{d}_{A_2}\phi_2\,, \tag{2.7}$$

with $\phi_2 = -\mathrm{d}U_2U_2^\dagger$. Substituting for A_1 and B_1 in Eq. (2.7) their expressions from Eq. (2.6), I get back Eq. (2.5), but with $U = U_2U_1$. Obviously, the transformation is invertible, since the choice $U_2 = U_1^\dagger$ will give the identity transformation. Taking $U \to 1$ continuously will also find the identity transformation, which shows that the transformation for B is connected to the identity. So it is perfectly acceptable to treat Eq. (2.5) as the SU(N) gauge transformation law for the fields. However, the action is not exactly invariant under the gauge transformation, but changes by a total divergence,

$$\int \mathrm{Tr}\, B'\wedge F' = \int \mathrm{Tr}\, B\wedge F + \int \mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(\phi\wedge UFU^\dagger)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where I have used Bianchi identity, cyclicity of trace, and the fact the ϕ is flat.

The gauge transformation law of A is of course the standard one, but that of B is unusual in several respects. The fact that it is inhomogeneous sets B apart from all fields, other than the gauge field A, which carry a representation of the gauge group. It makes B appear more like a connection than is usually thought. For an Abelian gauge group, all commutators vanish, and $B' = B$ is recovered, just as it would be for the homogeneous transformation law of Eq. (2.2). Note also that the inhomogeneous transformation of B in Eq. (2.5) makes sense only if B is a two-form and A is a one-form, and therefore is a symmetry of the action only in four dimensions. It is possible to construct similar transformations for higher p-forms in $p+2$ dimensions. For example a three form B_3 coupled to the gauge field via a $B_3\wedge F$ interaction in five dimensions can be taken to transform under the gauge group as

$$B_3' = UB_3U^\dagger + UAU^\dagger\wedge\phi\wedge\phi - \phi\wedge\phi\wedge UAU^\dagger\,. \tag{2.9}$$

The corresponding variation in the action is then

$$\delta\int \mathrm{Tr}\, B_3\wedge F = \int \mathrm{dTr}\,(\mathrm{d}\phi\wedge UFU^\dagger)\,. \tag{2.10}$$

It is possible to consider other generalizations of the transformation law. But three-forms or higher p-forms and corresponding higher dimensional actions will not be explored in this paper. Note that the specific transformation law of Eq. (2.5) holds only in four dimensions.

For results and theorems which use perturbation theory, superficially this new transformation law does not pose a major problem. This is because the inhomogeneous part is in some sense strictly *finite*, becoming irrelevant for gauge transformations infinitesimally close to the identity. But those transformations are all that is needed for an analysis using the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) differential. Let me write the transformation law for B with Lorentz indices and coupling constants restored,

$$\begin{aligned} B'_{\mu\nu} &= UB_{\mu\nu}U^\dagger - \frac{1}{m}[UA_{[\mu}U^\dagger, \partial_{\nu]}UU^\dagger] \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{gm}[\partial_\mu UU^\dagger, \partial_\nu UU^\dagger]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where I have written $A_\mu = A_\mu^a t^a, B_{\mu\nu} = B_{\mu\nu}^a t^a$, etc. I have explicitly included the constant m, but it seems to have any significance only if the two-form is dynamical, with mass dimension one. The BRST transformations corresponding to Eq. (2.5) are

$$\begin{aligned} sA_\mu^a &= \partial_\mu\omega^a + gf^{abc}A_\mu^b\omega^c\,, \\ sB_{\mu\nu}^a &= gf^{abc}B_{\mu\nu}^b\omega^c + \frac{g}{m}f^{abc}A_{[\mu}^b\partial_{\nu]}\omega^c\,, \\ s\omega^a &= -\frac{1}{2}gf^{abc}\omega^b\omega^c\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

This BRST operator is nilpotent, $s^2 = 0$, as a BRST operator should be. Comparison with the conventional BRST rules [16, 29, 30, 31, 36] shows that the inhomogeneous part of the gauge transformation law of B is like the vector gauge transformation with $\partial_\mu\omega^a$ playing the role of the vector parameter. This is why known perturbative results, which includes the vector gauge transformations in the analysis, may not need much modification. But

quite clearly it is not correct to think of the new gauge transformation as a special case of vector gauge transformation with parameter $\partial_\mu\omega^a$, since it is not possible to start from the latter and exponentiate it to get Eq. (2.5).

The total divergence which appears in the variation of the action will contribute to the conserved current of gauge symmetry. Consider an SU(N) gauge transformation $U = 1 + ig\xi^a t^a$ infinitesimally close to the identity. The corresponding change in the action is

$$\delta \int \frac{m}{4}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}B^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\rho\lambda} = -\frac{1}{2}\int \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\partial_\mu(\xi^a\partial_\nu F^a_{\rho\lambda}). \quad (2.13)$$

It follows that the conserved current of gauge symmetry has a *topologically conserved* component

$$j_T^{a\mu} = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\partial_\nu F^a_{\rho\lambda}\,. \quad (2.14)$$

This looks like a current of non-Abelian Dirac monopoles. This current is not gauge-covariant, but in a configuration where F vanishes on the boundary (e.g. Euclidean finite action) this makes a vanishing contribution to the conserved charge.

III. SYMMETRIC ACTIONS

In usual gauge theories, with usual objects, the gauge transformation law of a field depends only on the transformation U and the field itself. The appearance of the gauge field A in the gauge transformation law for B is thus quite unusual. However, these are objects in a theory with local SU(N) symmetry. If there is any dynamics of any field at all, not just dynamics of B, the theory must contain gauge covariant derivatives, and therefore a gauge field. Even if the gauge field to which B couples is not the dynamical gauge field A, but a flat connection, there is an inhomogeneous component of the gauge transformation law of B. This situation arises for the naive generalization of the duality relation between a two-form and a scalar [37, 38], or outside the horizon of black holes with a non-Abelian topological charge [21]. The inhomogeneous part of the gauge transformation law for B does not affect the results in these cases.

If the gauge field A is not constrained to be flat, it is possible to construct interesting actions which are invariant under the 'new and improved' gauge transformation law. Note that

$$\mathrm{d}A' = -\phi\wedge UAU^\dagger + U\mathrm{d}AU^\dagger - UAU^\dagger\wedge\phi + \mathrm{d}\phi\,, \quad (3.1)$$

so that both the combinations $(B+\mathrm{d}A)$ and $(B-A\wedge A)$ transform covariantly under the gauge group,

$$\begin{aligned} B' + \mathrm{d}A' &= U(B+\mathrm{d}A)\,U^\dagger\,, \\ B' - A'\wedge A' &= U(B - A\wedge A)U^\dagger\,. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

An interaction Lagrangian of the form $\mathrm{Tr}\,(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge F$ or $\mathrm{Tr}\,(B-A\wedge A)\wedge F$ will be exactly invariant under gauge transformations, and the conserved current for SU(N) gauge transformations will be gauge covariant. For either choice, the extra term is a total divergence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}\ \mathrm{d}A\wedge F &= \mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(A\wedge\mathrm{d}A + \frac{1}{3}A\wedge A\wedge A)\,, \\ \mathrm{Tr}\ A\wedge A\wedge F &= \mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{3}A\wedge A\wedge A\,. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

I can now construct several novel actions involving only A and B, with interesting physical implications, by demanding invariance only under the gauge transformation of Eq. (2.5). I shall ignore vector gauge transformations in this section, coming back to them in the next section. One reason for this exercise is to show that an inhomogeneous transformation law for B does not automatically rule out construction of invariant actions. Another reason will become apparent in the next section where I will argue that some of the actions constructed below are gauge fixed versions of actions with vector gauge symmetry. The starting point is either $\mathrm{Tr}\,B\wedge F$, which is invariant up to a total divergence, or $\mathrm{Tr}\,(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge F$, which is exactly invariant, but CP-violating. To either of this a quadratic term, constructed out of $(B+\mathrm{d}A)$, or the covariant field strength $(\mathrm{d}_A B - \mathrm{d}F)$, can be added for an invariant action.

The original topological action itself is of course the simplest example of an action symmetric under the new SU(N) gauge transformation rules. This action can be obviously modified without changing its classical content, by replacing B by $(B+\mathrm{d}A)$ or $(B - A\wedge A)$, to give a triplet of actions differing only by a total divergence,

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\,B\wedge F \\ &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\,(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge F \\ &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\,(B - A\wedge A)\wedge F\,, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where the equalities hold up to total divergences. Although the equations of motion derived from these actions are the same, quantum theories built from them will behave differently in the non-perturbative regime. They also have different properties under CP. To see this, note that B can be chosen to transform under CP like $*F$ so that the first action can be made CP-conserving. But the other two equivalent actions will necessarily violate CP.

Another class of CP-violating actions come from using quadratic terms of the type $B\wedge B$. An example is the action

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\left(B\wedge F - \frac{1}{2}(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge(B+\mathrm{d}A)\right) \\ &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\left(B\wedge A\wedge A - \frac{1}{2}B\wedge B - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{d}A\wedge\mathrm{d}A\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The equation of motion following from this action by varying B is $B = A\wedge A$. This may be substituted in

the action [39], giving

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\left(A\wedge A\wedge F-\frac{1}{2}F\wedge F\right) \\ &= \int -\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\;\mathrm{d}A\wedge\mathrm{d}A\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

which is a total divergence. Obviously there are many variations on this theme which arise from replacing B in $B\wedge F$ by either of the two gauge covariant combinations and from using $(B-A\wedge A)$ in one or both factors of the second term. All these actions are classically equivalent, i.e., they differ by total divergences. They are also equivalent in the path integral in the same sense, after Gaussian integration over B. So all the information about the corresponding quantum theories reside on the boundary of space-time. An interesting point is that some actions of this CP-violating class vanish altogether upon using the equations of motion for B. An example is

$$S_1' = \int \mathrm{Tr}\;\left((B-A\wedge A)\wedge F-(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge(B-A\wedge A)\right)\,, \tag{3.7}$$

for which the equation of motion of B is $B=A\wedge A$, so that $S_1'=0$.

An example of an action which is not a total divergence is a first order formulation of Yang-Mills theory, along the lines of [16, 17, 18], but without vector gauge symmetry,

$$S_2=\int \mathrm{Tr}\left(B\wedge F+\frac{1}{2}(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge *(B+\mathrm{d}A)\right). \tag{3.8}$$

The equation of motion for B is $B+\mathrm{d}A=*F$, which can be put back into the action. This action is then classically equivalent, i.e. equal up to a total divergence, to Yang-Mills theory. Again, there are several variations on this theme, not all of which have local dynamics. One example of this type is

$$S_2'=\int \mathrm{Tr}\left(B\wedge F+(B+\mathrm{d}A)\wedge *(B-A\wedge A)\right). \tag{3.9}$$

The equation of motion for B derived from this action is $B=\frac{1}{2}(-\mathrm{d}A+A\wedge A+*F)$. Substituting this expression for B into the action produces

$$S_2'=\int -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\;\mathrm{d}A\wedge\mathrm{d}A\,, \tag{3.10}$$

which is a total divergence. So even though the action written in terms of B seems to require a metric, actually the dynamics it describes is independent of the metric and lives fully on the boundary of the space-time.

I should mention actions of another type before ending this section. Since the field strength F is a gauge covariant object, any constant multiple of of F can be added to $(B-A\wedge A)$ to produce a gauge covariant combination. Among all such combinations, $(B-A\wedge A-F)$ is somewhat special. It will be argued in the next section that actions constructed out of this combination of fields are gauge equivalent to actions with explicit vector gauge symmetry. Two examples are the first order formulations of the Yang-Mills action and the topological Yang-Mills action,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{YM} &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\Big[(B-A\wedge A-F)\wedge F \\ &\qquad +\frac{1}{2}(B-A\wedge A-F)\wedge *(B-A\wedge A-F)\Big] \\ &\equiv \int \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\;F\wedge *F\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{TYM} &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\Big[(B-A\wedge A-F)\wedge F \\ &\qquad -\frac{1}{2}(B-A\wedge A-F)\wedge (B-A\wedge A-F)\Big] \\ &\equiv \int \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\;F\wedge F\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where the equivalences are obtained by substituting the equations of motion for B into the respective actions.

Another action which should be mentioned is that of a dynamical non-Abelian two-form. Dynamics requires a gauge covariant field strength to be defined for B, and the purpose is served by $\tilde{H}=\mathrm{d}_A(B+\mathrm{d}A)\equiv\mathrm{d}_A(B-A\wedge A)=\mathrm{d}_AB-\mathrm{d}F$. Like other gauge covariant combinations mentioned in this section, this field strength is not invariant under vector gauge transformations. With the help of this field strength, I can now write down an action in which the two-form B is a dynamical field,

$$S_3=\int \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{H}\wedge *\tilde{H}+\frac{1}{2}F\wedge *F+B\wedge F\right). \tag{3.13}$$

The B-independent part of this action is a nonlinear σ-model for the gauge field A. The term quadratic in derivatives of A reads, with gauge and Lorentz indices restored,

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{4}(\delta^{bd}+g^2f^{abc}f^{ade}A^c_\lambda A^{\lambda e})\,\partial_{[\mu}A^b_{\nu]}\partial^{[\mu}A^{\nu]d} \\ &\qquad -\frac{1}{2}g^2f^{abc}f^{ade}\partial_{[\mu}A^b_{\nu]}A^c_\lambda\partial^{[\nu}A^{\lambda]d}A^{\mu e}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

This action is not power counting renormalizable, nor should it lead to a consistent quantum theory, like any nonlinear σ-model in four dimensions. But I will argue in the next section that this action is gauge equivalent to the theory with an auxiliary field and explicit vector gauge symmetry, which is known to be renormalizable [31]. In the Abelian limit where the structure constants vanish, $\tilde{H}$ becomes the usual field strength for a set of Abelian two-forms, $\tilde{H}\to\mathrm{d}B$. So this action then becomes the same as that for a set of topologically massive Abelian gauge fields.

Obviously, many other actions can be constructed using Eq. (2.5) as the gauge transformation laws and they will correspond to different physical systems. One can even construct actions which do not have the $B\wedge F$ term

as the cornerstone. I will not explore such actions here. Finally, for p-forms in $p+2$ dimensions, a generalized SU(N) gauge transformation law can be trivially constructed by demanding covariance of

$$B_p - A \wedge A \wedge \cdots \wedge A \; (p \; factors) \,. \tag{3.15}$$

Just as the result for $p = 3$ differs from the one given earlier in Eq. (2.9), clearly there are several different generalizations for higher p-forms.

IV. AUXILIARY ONE-FORM

The actions mentioned in the previous section, except for the pure $B \wedge F$ action and its modifications as shown in Eq. (3.4), were not symmetric under vector gauge transformations. These need to be reintroduced into the discussion. The interaction Lagrangian $\mathrm{Tr}\, B \wedge F$ is symmetric up to a total divergence under the vector gauge transformations of Eq. (2.3). Any term quadratic in B, including a possible kinetic term, is not invariant. This is obvious for terms like $B \wedge B$ or $B \wedge *B$, for kinetic terms this is because the 'field strength' $\mathrm{d}_A B$ changes under these transformations,

$$\mathrm{d}_A B \to \mathrm{d}_A B + F \wedge \xi - \xi \wedge F \,. \tag{4.1}$$

Indeed a theorem [33] asserts that a kinetic term for the two-form, invariant under both types of gauge transformations, cannot be constructed unless additional fields are introduced to compensate for the vector gauge transformations. Note that since this theorem was proven by using the BRST structure of these theories, the modification of the gauge symmetry displayed in the previous section should not change its proof.

Some actions which use auxiliary one-form fields to compensate for the vector gauge transformations have been known for some time [16, 22]. In these actions, a one-form field C is introduced, and is assumed to shift under these transformations,

$$A' = A \,, \qquad B' = B + \mathrm{d}_A \xi \,, \qquad C' = C + \xi \,. \tag{4.2}$$

Obviously the combination $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ remains invariant under these transformations, as does the compensated field strength

$$H = \mathrm{d}_A B - F \wedge C + C \wedge F \,. \tag{4.3}$$

How does C behave under usual gauge transformations? Clearly it has to transform in the adjoint representation. There is now no need for $\mathrm{d}A$ to cancel the inhomogeneous part of gauge transformations of B. Instead, the auxiliary field C can be taken to transform inhomogeneously, like a connection, under the gauge group,

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= UAU^\dagger + \phi \,, \\ B' &= UBU^\dagger + \mathrm{d}_{A'}\phi \,, \\ C' &= UCU^\dagger + \phi \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

With this choice, the combination $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ transforms covariantly under the gauge group, $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C) \to U(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)U^\dagger$. The field strength H also transforms covariantly, $H \to UHU^\dagger$. Both these combinations, $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ and H, are also invariant under the vector gauge transformations in Eq. (4.2), with ξ transforming homogeneously in the adjoint, $\xi' = U\xi U^\dagger$. Therefore, terms quadratic in $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ or H can be used for construction of symmetric actions, invariant under both usual and vector gauge transformations. I will not mention such actions separately here, they are discussed in [16, 17, 18, 22, 29, 30, 31]. Note that if C is taken to transform homogeneously under the gauge group, invariant actions have to be constructed with $(B + \mathrm{d}A - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ or with $(B - A \wedge A - F - \mathrm{d}_A C) \equiv B - \mathrm{d}_A(A + C)$. These possibilities will be ignored, since they correspond to redefinitions of C. Henceforth C will be taken to transform like a gauge field, i.e., according to equation Eq. (4.4).

Since the flat connection ϕ does not transform homogeneously under the gauge group, but the vector parameter ξ has to do so, it is clear that Eq. (4.4) cannot be a special case of vector gauge transformations, despite the formal similarity. Nor is it possible to take the vector parameter ξ to transform like a connection, because connections do not add, so vector gauge transformations will not form a group. Alternatively, if the vector parameter is an arbitrary connection, the properties of C under usual gauge transformations will be ill-defined. This also provides an additional reason why it is not possible to set $C = 0$ by a gauge choice. Since C transforms like a connection, even if it is made to vanish in one gauge, it will be non-zero upon an SU(N) gauge transformation.

The BRST transformations for C are similar to vector gauge transformations as was the case for the two-form,

$$sC^a_\mu = \frac{1}{m}\partial_\mu \omega^a + g f^{abc} C^b_\mu \omega^c \,. \tag{4.5}$$

Taken together with Eq. (2.12), the BRST operator is nilpotent, $s^2 = 0$, and all calculations which use BRST analysis will go through. In other words, the algebraic proofs of renormalizability, for the massive vector theory [31], or for the first-order Yang-Mills theory [17, 18], should hold with minor modifications. For finite transformations, the picture differs radically from that in those articles, C is now a connection under the gauge group, and a vector gauge transformation shifts it by the difference of any two connections.

This picture leads to another interesting symmetry transformation. Let $\tilde{U}(x)$ be an arbitrary SU(N) matrix valued field, unrelated to the SU(N) gauge transformation, and let the flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$ be defined as $\tilde{\phi} = -\mathrm{d}\tilde{U}\tilde{U}^\dagger$. A vector gauge transformation can be made upon the fields B and C using a constant multiple of the difference of A and $\tilde{\phi}$. That may not seem particularly significant, since it is just a special choice of the vector parameter. However, if the theory contains only the field strength H and not the combination $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$, I can freely shift B by a constant multiple of F, the field

strength of the gauge field, since under this shift

$$B \to B + \alpha F\,, \qquad H \to H + \alpha \mathrm{d}_A F = H\,, \tag{4.6}$$

by Bianchi identity. The interaction term $B \wedge F$ changes by a total divergence under this shift, so this is a symmetry of the action. For an Abelian two-form this shift $B \to B + \alpha F$ is just a special case of the vector gauge transformations with the special choice $\xi = A$. On the other hand, in the case of the non-Abelian two-form, there is no choice of ξ for which $F = \mathrm{d}_A \xi$. Indeed, such a shift for the non-Abelian two-form is not even a local symmetry transformation, cannot be implemented by a local constraint, and can be included in the BRST charge only by using a constant ghost field [31].

Because of this, if the local transformation is combined with the global shift, it produces a completely new type of symmetry transformation,

$$\begin{aligned} C' &= C + \alpha(A - \tilde{\phi})\,, \quad A' = A\,, \\ B' &= B + \alpha(A - \tilde{\phi}) \wedge (A - \tilde{\phi})\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

with α an arbitrary constant. It is easy to see that the SU(N) transformation properties of these fields are not affected provided $\tilde{\phi}$ is taken to transform as a connection as well. This changes the $B \wedge F$ interaction term by a total divergence, and leaves the compensated field strength H of Eq. (4.3) invariant,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \int \mathrm{Tr}\, B \wedge F &= \alpha \int \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{Tr}\, (\frac{1}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A - \tilde{\phi} \wedge F)\,, \\ \delta(B - \mathrm{d}_A C) &= -\alpha F\,, \\ \delta H &= 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

It follows that an action containing the field strength H and the interaction $B \wedge F$ will be invariant (up to a total divergence) under this set of transformations. Even the pure $B \wedge F$ action is invariant under it. The corresponding conserved current, from the variation of the $B \wedge F$ term, depends on the arbitrary flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$.

Why is this a new type of symmetry? Since $\tilde{U}$ is an arbitrary local SU(N) matrix, the flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$ is constructed out of arbitrary space-time dependent parameters and their derivatives. So these would seem to be local transformations. However, in general local transformations are generated by local first-class constraints. The vector gauge transformations of Eq. (4.2) are local, and they are generated by local constraints [40, 41]. On the other hand, the shift $B \to B + \alpha F$ is a *global* transformation for a non-Abelian B. But it is not possible to write local constraints which can generate the transformations of Eq. (4.7). The simplest way to show this is by noting that the local part of these transformations is not connected to the identity, i.e., $\tilde{\phi} \to 0$ or $\tilde{U} \to 1$ in Eq. (4.7) does not lead to the identity transformation. So in particular transformations for infinitesimal $\tilde{\phi}$, i.e. for $\tilde{U}$ infinitesimally close to the identity, cannot be written as transformations which are themselves infinitesimally close to the identity transformation. Since the Poisson brackets of a constraint with the variables of the theory produce infinitesimal transformations, these transformations cannot be produced by constraints. It also means that this symmetry will not appear in the BRST charge.

This can be seen directly in the BRST approach, starting with the transformation for infinitesimal $\tilde{\phi}$. For $\tilde{U} = 1 + ig\delta\lambda\theta^a t^a$, with $\delta\lambda$ an anticommuting constant and θ^a an anticommuting field (the would be ghost), I can write the infinitesimal changes in the fields as following from Eq. (4.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta B &= \alpha A \wedge A + \alpha\delta\lambda(\mathrm{d}\theta \wedge A + A \wedge \mathrm{d}\theta)\,, \\ \delta C &= \alpha(A + \delta\lambda \mathrm{d}\theta)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\theta = igt^a \partial_\mu \theta^a \mathrm{d}x^\mu$. Obviously the derivative $\delta/\delta\lambda$, which would be part of the BRST operator, does not have any meaning. This is because α has been treated as a finite constant, so perhaps it should be replaced by $\delta\lambda\,\alpha$, where α is now a constant ghost, as in [31]? This will clearly not produce the correct BRST operator in this case either, because then the θ-dependent terms will disappear from Eq. (4.9). So there is no BRST construction which includes this symmetry, which is another way of showing that it cannot be generated by local constraints, since the BRST charge has to include all local constraints. Since the BRST charge is fundamental to the local Hamiltonian quantization of gauge theories (see for example [42, 43]), another possible interpretation of this is that a full quantum theory of this system must necessarily include non-local objects (i.e. strings) and operators, with appropriate induced actions of the symmetry group, in order to maintain the classical symmetries. This is not very surprising since a two-form naturally couples to world sheets.

This conclusion is based on the failure to assign a non-zero ghost number to an infinitesimal $\tilde{\phi}$. On the other hand it is possible to construct a BRST operator which includes an arbitrary flat SU(N) connection $\tilde{\phi}$ of zero ghost number and a constant field α of ghost number one. Then there is a family of BRST operators parametrized by $\tilde{\phi}$, for a given set of fields and ghosts, including α. Any two such BRST operators anticommute, suggesting a degeneracy of quantum states, labeled by flat connections. Lifting this degeneracy will require choosing a specific flat connection. This is analogous, but not identical, to choosing a vacuum in spontaneously broken gauge theories. The transformations of Eq. (4.7) should not therefore be confused with usual local symmetry transformations. These should be called *semiglobal* transformations, elements of a class of global transformations parametrized by local SU(N) matrices $\tilde{U}$.

The fact that the auxiliary connection C can be shifted by the difference of two connections also provides a way of relating actions constructed in this section with the help of C, and those of the previous section, constructed without C and without vector gauge symmetry. Consider the case where these two connections are C and A, i.e., consider a vector gauge transformation with $\xi = \alpha(A -$

C) where α is some constant. The transformed fields are

$$\begin{aligned} B' &= B + \alpha F + \alpha A \wedge A - \alpha\, \mathrm{d}_A C \\ C' &= (1-\alpha)C + \alpha A\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

The compensated field strength H remains invariant, as it should under a vector gauge transformation, but in addition it has a familiar form for $\alpha = 1$ in terms of the transformed fields. If I choose $\alpha = 1$, in Eq. (4.10), the two connections become related to each other by $C' = A$, and then the field strength is $H = \mathrm{d}_A B' - F \wedge A + A \wedge F$, which because of Bianchi identity can be written as $H = \mathrm{d}_A B' - \mathrm{d}F$. This has the same form as the field strength defined in the previous section, before the introduction of the auxiliary one-form. So even though C cannot be set to vanish by a gauge choice in Eq. (4.3), it can be absorbed into B in the aforementioned sense, whereby it is 'replaced' by A. Note also that for $\alpha = 1$, the invariant combination $(B - \mathrm{d}_A C)$ can be written as

$$B' - \mathrm{d}_{A'} C' = B' - \mathrm{d}_A A = B' - F - A \wedge A\,. \tag{4.11}$$

This links the actions mentioned in the previous section with those mentioned here. Finally, note that by a similar argument, C can also be 'replaced' by an arbitrary flat connection ϕ via a vector gauge transformation.

V. TWO CONNECTIONS FOR TWO-FORM

In the previous section it was shown that the auxiliary vector field C transforms like a gauge field under usual gauge transformations, and shifts by the 'difference of two connections' under a vector gauge transformation. It was also shown that by an appropriate vector gauge transformation, the auxiliary field could be 'shifted away' to be replaced, in a manner, by the gauge field A. In this section the picture of C as a second connection in the theory will be made more explicit, and more actions will be shown to be related by gauge symmetry to the ones already mentioned.

The starting point is the observation that the auxiliary connection C always appears in conjunction with the two-form B. In fact, it is needed for all actions with vector gauge symmetry, except for the pure $B \wedge F$ action. But even this form of the action need not be treated as sacrosanct, since C can be absorbed in B in a specific manner using vector gauge transformations. Then I can conclude that the non-Abelian two-form B and the auxiliary connection C cannot be separately included in any theory, but has to be considered as a pair.

Is it then possible to formulate the gauge transformation laws of the pair (B, C) purely in terms of themselves without referring to the usual gauge field A as was done earlier? This would remove the dependence of B on the gauge field A, which is somewhat artificial, since there is no converse dependence — a theory of the gauge field can be defined without invoking B. This requires that the gauge transformation laws described in Eq. (4.4) be thought of as being in a special choice of gauge for the vector gauge transformations.

Following this argument, let me first rewrite the SU(N) gauge transformations for A, B, and C as

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= UAU^\dagger + \phi \\ B' &= UBU^\dagger + UCU^\dagger \wedge \phi + \phi \wedge UCU^\dagger + \phi \wedge \phi \\ C' &= UCU^\dagger + \phi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

These are the same as the rules of Eq. (4.4), but with the gauge field C taking the place of the gauge field A in the transformation rule for B. It will be shown later that these are in fact equivalent to the earlier rules.

Just as in the earlier incarnation, these transformations combine according to the group multiplication law of SU(N). This can be seen by applying two successive SU(N) gauge transformations U_1 and U_2 and using Eq.s (2.6) and (2.7), but substituting C for A in those equations. One immediate consequence of choosing Eq. (5.1) as the gauge transformation rules is that the $B \wedge F$ term is no longer gauge invariant, as expected from the discussion above. The action that should be used in its place is

$$S_0 = \int \mathrm{Tr}\ (B + \mathrm{d}C) \wedge F = \int \mathrm{Tr}\ (B \wedge F - C \wedge \mathrm{d}F)\,, \tag{5.2}$$

where the second equality holds up to a total divergence. The second term of this action looks like a magnetic monopole term in the Abelian limit $g \to 0$. It does not have a clear interpretation for non-Abelian theories, since $\mathrm{d}F$ is not a gauge-covariant object.

In any case, this choice of gauge transformation rules simplifies the vector gauge transformations quite remarkably. Now it is the combination $B + \mathrm{d}C$ which transforms homogeneously, $B' + \mathrm{d}C' = U(B + \mathrm{d}C)U^\dagger$. I can now define vector gauge transformations for the non-Abelian two-form without reference to any connection and in fact these are exactly the same as the familiar Kalb-Ramond symmetry [35]

$$B \to B + \mathrm{d}\xi\,, \qquad C \to C - \xi\,. \tag{5.3}$$

Here ξ is a one-form which transforms homogeneously under the gauge group, i.e., the difference of two connections, $\xi \to U\xi U^\dagger$. This choice ensures that C' also transforms like a connection, and the behavior of B under SU(N) gauge transformations in maintained. Indeed, if an SU(N) gauge transformation U is applied subsequent to the Kalb-Ramond transformation, and ξ is taken to transform homogeneously, the fields transform as

$$\begin{aligned} C' &= U(C - \xi)U^\dagger + \phi \\ B' &= U(B + \mathrm{d}\xi)U^\dagger + UC'U^\dagger \wedge \phi + \phi \wedge UC'U^\dagger + \phi \wedge \phi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Therefore, just as in the previous section, the auxiliary one-form C transforms like a gauge field under ordinary

SU(N) gauge transformations, and shifts by the difference of two connections under Kalb-Ramond symmetry. Note that I am making a distinction between the vector gauge symmetry of Eq. (4.2), which involves the gauge covariant exterior derivative d_A, and the Kalb-Ramond symmetry, which requires only the ordinary exterior derivative d. I will show that actions invariant under the gauge transformations of Eq. (5.1) and the Kalb-Ramond transformations are also equivalent to the actions of section III by a symmetry transformation.

Before going on to discuss invariant actions, let me briefly mention one peculiarity of the (B, C) system. The combination $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ appears to have another obvious symmetry, under $C \to C + \mathrm{d}\chi$ where χ is a scalar. This symmetry is not compatible with gauge symmetry, since $C + \mathrm{d}\chi$ cannot transform as in Eq. (5.1) for any choice of χ. So this symmetry is not likely to have any physical significance. However, the field B and C must always appear in the combination $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ and its derivatives, so this symmetry will always be present in the action.

Invariant actions involving the (B, C) pair are now easy to construct. Note that a 'field strength' for C,

$$F_C = \mathrm{d}C + C \wedge C\,, \tag{5.5}$$

is covariant under SU(N) gauge transformations, but is not invariant under Kalb-Ramond transformations. So it will not appear in an invariant action. Note also that even though C transforms like a gauge field, the gauge covariant derivative is still defined as d_A, since it is a good idea to leave the covariant derivative unmolested after a Kalb-Ramond transformation.

Then the actions invariant under both the gauge group and the Kalb-Ramond symmetry are already known. These are simply the actions mentioned in section III, but with $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ replacing $(B + \mathrm{d}A)$. The $B \wedge F$ term, or its equivalents as in Eq. (3.4), has to be replaced by the term S_0 as in Eq. (5.2) as well. For example, the action corresponding to the parity violating action S_1 of Eq. (3.5) is

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\left((B + \mathrm{d}C) \wedge F - \frac{1}{2}(B + \mathrm{d}C) \wedge (B + \mathrm{d}C)\right) \\ &= \int \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\; F \wedge F\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where the second equality comes from substituting the equation of motion $B = F - \mathrm{d}C$ into the action. Another example is the action for the first order formulation of Yang-Mills theory, which is now

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \int \mathrm{Tr}\left((B + \mathrm{d}C) \wedge F + \frac{1}{2}(B + \mathrm{d}C) \wedge *(B + \mathrm{d}C)\right) \\ &= \int \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\; F \wedge *F\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Again I have substituted the equation of motion for B, which is $B = *F - \mathrm{d}C$, into the action to produce the second equality. Unlike in section III where actions were constructed from only the gauge field A and the two-form B, and only invariance under SU(N) gauge transformations was imposed, the requirement of Kalb-Ramond symmetry rules out various combinations. For example, the combination $(B - C \wedge C)$, while covariant under SU(N) gauge transformations, is not invariant under the Kalb-Ramond transformation. On the other hand, just as in section III, any constant multiple of the gauge field strength F can be added to $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ for a gauge covariant, Kalb-Ramond invariant combination. It is easy to see that actions built with those combinations are equivalent to the ones already mentioned.

As mentioned earlier, the gauge covariant derivative, which is needed to construct dynamical actions, should be taken to be d_A, even though C is also a gauge field, because C is not invariant under Kalb-Ramond transformations. The field strength for the two-form is constructed with the gauge covariant derivative d_A,

$$H = \mathrm{d}_A(B + \mathrm{d}C) = \mathrm{d}_A B + A \wedge \mathrm{d}C - \mathrm{d}C \wedge A\,, \tag{5.8}$$

and the action for the dynamical two-form is then

$$S_3 = \int \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}H \wedge *H + \frac{1}{2}F \wedge *F + B \wedge F - C \wedge \mathrm{d}F\right). \tag{5.9}$$

Needless to say, this action reduces to the usual Abelian action of topologically massive fields (either A or B) in the Abelian limit. Another interesting point is that in that limit this action can be thought of as a (partial) first order formulation, with C being a dual gauge field.

In the non-Abelian theory, C is shifted by the difference of two connections under a Kalb-Ramond transformation. I can choose the two connections to be C and A as in the section IV, $\xi = \alpha(C - A)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} B' &= B + \alpha \mathrm{d}(C - A)\,, \\ C' &= C - \alpha(C - A)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Since this is a special case of the Kalb-Ramond transformations, the combination $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ remains invariant, as does the field strength H. For $\alpha = 1$, this has the effect of replacing C by A. Thus the actions mentioned earlier in section III are equivalent to the actions mentioned in this section as well.

The field strength H of Eq. (5.8) is invariant, as before, under a semiglobal transformation, constructed with the help of an arbitrary flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$ transforming in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. But these now take a slightly different form,

$$\begin{aligned} B' &= B + \alpha\,(A \wedge A - \tilde{\phi} \wedge \tilde{\phi})\,, \\ C' &= C - \alpha\,(A - \tilde{\phi})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

The combination $(B + \mathrm{d}C)$ is not invariant under these transformations, while the field strength H is. As before, these are not connected to the identity transformation for $\tilde{\phi} \to 0$. The conserved current for this transformation depends on the form of the interaction term. For the action

of Eq. (5.9) the current depends on the flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$ and is proportional to

$$\mathrm{Tr}\ (A \wedge A \wedge A + \tilde{\phi} \wedge F) \tag{5.12}$$

As in section IV, the BRST operators which produce the transformations of Eq. (5.11) must be constructed with a constant ghost field α and an arbitrary (commuting) flat connection $\tilde{\phi}$. Consequently they are again parametrized by the space of flat connections $\tilde{\phi}$.

VI. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In this paper I have argued that an antisymmetric tensor potential valued in the adjoint representation should have an inhomogeneous component in its gauge transformation rule, as shown in Eq. (2.5). It is not clear if there is a geometrical interpretation of this rule, i.e. a geometrical object which corresponds to this. But at any rate it opens up new avenues of investigation. These new gauge transformation rules are not in contradiction with theorems based on BRST analysis. In particular the new rules do not obviate the need for an auxiliary one-form in actions containing terms quadratic in B.

I have also shown that the auxiliary one-form C transforms as a gauge field. Therefore it cannot be shifted away to zero by a vector gauge transformation, because an ordinary gauge transformation changes a vanishing gauge field to a non-vanishing flat connection. But it can be 'replaced' by the usual gauge field A via a vector gauge transformation. The actions in section IV can be related in this way to the actions in section III, which may be thought of as being somewhat analogous to a *unitarity gauge* choice for these theories. An outcome of this is that the action for the topological mass generation mechanism becomes gauge equivalent to a nonlinear σ-model for the gauge field, as in Eq. (3.14). This action also has a new kind of *semiglobal* symmetry which depends on arbitrary flat connections, but is connected to the identity only in the limit of a vanishing global parameter. This symmetry is not generated by local constraints, unlike all other known local symmetries in classical field theory. The conserved current or this symmetry is parametrized by the space of flat connections. It is in fact possible to construct a family of BRST operators, parametrized by flat connections, which anticommute with one another.

I have also shown that it is possible to define inhomogeneous gauge transformation rules for the pair of fields (B, C) without referring to the gauge field A. The actions invariant under these rules are symmetric under the usual (Abelian) Kalb-Ramond symmetry. Unlike for the vector gauge symmetry, the integral of B on a closed 2-surface is invariant under Kalb-Ramond symmetry. The actions of section V are also equivalent, by gauge transformations and field redefinitions, to the actions discussed in the earlier sections. The symmetries and actions mentioned in this paper should be useful for all $B \wedge F$ type theories, including gravity.

[1] D. Z. Freedman, *"Gauge Theories Of Antisymmetric Tensor Fields,"* Cal Tech preprint CALT-68-624.
[2] K. Seo, M. Okawa and A. Sugamoto, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 3744 (1979).
[3] D. Z. Freedman and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **177**, 282 (1981).
[4] A. S. Schwarz, Lett. Math. Phys. **2**, 247 (1978);
[5] A. S. Schwarz, Commun. Math. Phys. **67**, 1 (1979).
[6] E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. **117**, 353 (1988).
[7] D. Birmingham et al, Phys. Rept. **209**, 129 (1991).
[8] J. F. Schonfeld, Nucl. Phys. B **185**, 157 (1981).
[9] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 975 (1982).
[10] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Annals Phys. **140**, 372 (1982) [Erratum-ibid. **185**, 406.1988 ANNYA,281,409 (1982)].
[11] G. T. Horowitz, Commun. Math. Phys. **125**, 417 (1989).
[12] M. Blau and G. Thompson, Annals Phys. **205**, 130 (1991).
[13] J. C. Baez, *"Knots and quantum gravity: Progress and prospects,"* gr-qc/9410018.
[14] P. Peldan, Class. Quant. Grav. **11**, 1087 (1994)
[15] F. Fucito, M. Martellini and M. Zeni, Nucl. Phys. B **496**, 259 (1997)
[16] A. S. Cattaneo et al, Commun. Math. Phys. **197**, 571 (1998).
[17] F. Fucito et al, Phys. Lett. B **404**, 94 (1997).
[18] A. Accardi and A. Belli, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **12**, 2353 (1997).
[19] H. Chan, J. Faridani and S. T. Tsou, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6134 (1995)
[20] H. Chan, J. Faridani and S. Tsou, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 7293 (1996)
[21] A. Lahiri, Phys. Lett. B **297**, 248 (1992).
[22] A. Lahiri, *"Generating vector boson masses,"* hep-th/9301060.
[23] E. Cremmer and J. Scherk, Nucl. Phys. B **72**, 117 (1974).
[24] A. Aurilia and Y. Takahashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **66**, 693 (1981).
[25] T. R. Govindarajan, J. Phys. G **G8**, L17 (1982).
[26] T. J. Allen, M. J. Bowick and A. Lahiri, Phys. Lett. B **237**, 47 (1990).
[27] T. J. Allen, M. J. Bowick and A. Lahiri, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **6**, 559 (1991).
[28] J. A. Minahan and R. C. Warner, *"Stuckelberg Revisited,"* Florida U. preprint UFIFT-HEP-89-15.
[29] D. S. Hwang and C. Lee, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 30 (1997).
[30] A. Lahiri, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 5045 (1997).
[31] A. Lahiri, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 105002 (2001).
[32] C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. B **167**, 63 (1986).
[33] M. Henneaux et al, Phys. Lett. B **410**, 195 (1997).
[34] A. Lahiri, *"Gauge transformations of the non-Abelian two-form,"* hep-th/0107104.
[35] M. Kalb and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 2273 (1974).

[36] J. Thierry-Mieg and L. Baulieu, Nucl. Phys. B **228**, 259 (1983).
[37] I. Oda and S. Yahikozawa, Phys. Lett. B **234**, 69 (1990).
[38] A. Smailagic and E. Spallucci, Phys. Lett. B **489**, 435 (2000).
[39] M. Henneaux, *"On the use of auxiliary fields in classical mechanics and in field theory,"* ULB-TH2-91-04 *in Contemporary Mathematics, Proceedings of the 1991 Joint Summer Research Conference on Mathematical Aspects of Classical Field Theory.*
[40] C. Y. Lee and D. W. Lee, J. Phys. A **31**, 7809 (1998).
[41] E. Harikumar, A. Lahiri and M. Sivakumar, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 105020 (2001).
[42] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, "Quantization of gauge systems," *Princeton, USA: Univ. Pr. (1992).*
[43] G. Barnich, F. Brandt and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rept. **338**, 439 (2000)